

AT AUCTION
BY WILL E. FISHER
AUCTIONEER

THIS DAY! At Auction

ON WEDNESDAY, APRIL 10

Beginning at 10 o'clock a. m. I will offer for sale the

Furniture and Furnishings

OF COTTAGE NO. 11, IN GARDEN LANE, situated about 150 feet mauka Union Street, between Hotel and Beretania Streets, consisting of

- 1 Antique Oak Bedroom Set, complete.
- 3 Golden Oak Bedroom Sets, complete.
- 6 Mosquito Nets.
- 5 Mattresses.
- 5 Spring Mattresses.
- 1 Oak Bed.
- 1 Gasoline Stove.
- 1 Oil Stove.
- Also, Lace Curtains.
- Window Shades.
- Rugs.
- Kitchen Utensils.
- Crockery, Etc., Etc.

WILL E. FISHER, Auctr.

At Auction

ON FRIDAY, APRIL 12,

At 10 o'clock I will offer for sale at my salesroom, corner of Merchant and Alakea streets, for account of whom it may concern,

- Attorney's Desk.
- Office Table.
- McNeal & Urban Safe.
- Typewriter and Stand.
- Book Case.
- Pigeon Hole Case.
- Map.
- Office Chairs and
- A valuable assortment of Law Books, Etc.
- Also Mahogany Sideboard.
- One 1/2 Bed and Springs.

WILL E. FISHER, Auctr.

At Auction

SATURDAY, APRIL 13,

AT 12 O'CLOCK NOON.

By order of F. E. THOMPSON, ESQ., Administrator of the Estate of J. J. STEWART, deceased, I will offer at Public Auction at my salesroom, corner Merchant and Alakea streets,

- Watch and Chain.
- A complete set of Carpenter's Tools.
- 1 Chest for same.
- 1 Trunk and contents, being wearing apparel.
- 1 Valise containing Clothing.
- Etc., Etc., Etc.
- All on exhibition at my salesroom.

WILL E. FISHER, Auctr.

Boardman Homestead

Real Estate For Sale.

THIS MAGNIFICENT BLOCK OF REAL ESTATE as per the following diagram for sale as a whole or in subdivisions:

J. F. Hackfeld Esq. John Wrigg Esq.

LUNALILO STREET

75	75	75	75	
4	3	2	1	
				180
				(Small St.) 30
5	6	7	8	
				180
75	75	75	75	

KINAU STREET.

O. E. Hustace Esq. C. M. Cooke Esq.

No property offered here in Honolulu presents the same opportunities for desirable building lots as the above—elevated as it is—possessing an unobstructed panoramic marine view of the ocean, harbor and Honolulu, its proximity to the business center, its transit facilities on the line of the proposed electric line, within a block of the Beretania street cars, and in the neighborhood of the best residences of this city makes this site exceptionally desirable for residence purposes.

Terms most liberal—One-third cash (if desired), balance in equal payments in one and two years at 7 per cent interest only on deferred payments. Further particulars of

WILL E. FISHER,
REAL ESTATE AGENT
AND AUCTIONEER,
Corner Merchant and Alakea Streets.

DISPENSARY DISCUSSION OPEN TO THE PUBLIC

IV. LOCAL APPLICATION OF THE DISPENSARY MEASURE.

I have shown that wherever government monopoly of the liquor traffic has been in operation it has resulted (1) in the decrease of crime (2) in less drunkenness; (3) decrease in the consumption of liquor and consequent improvement in public health; (4) in increased comforts to the families of drinking men; (5) in the improved quality of intoxicants consumed; (6) in public contentment and increasing popularity of the system wherever in vogue.

I have also shown by defining the principles underlying the drink habit (1) that the unrestricted sale of intoxicants has proven detrimental to public morality and a menace to the State; (2) that prohibition is practically inoperative because the force of the natural desire for drink tempts individual enterprise to illicit liquor traffic; (3) that, if the natural desire to drink is the only incentive for consumption of liquor, the cheapening of the price of the commodity cannot increase its sale; (4) that the saloon is a means for the exploitation of individual enterprise to excite the desire for drink and furnish the drinker credit to continue drinking and otherwise to create a consumption for liquor; (5) that the high license system creates a private monopoly that takes advantage of the natural desire for drink and every means for exciting the drink habit and to increase consumption; (6) that thereby the drinking public is defrauded in proportion as the price of liquor is increased by this monopoly plus the total amount gained by the inciting customs of the saloon; (7) that illicit liquor selling exists in proportion as private monopoly raises the price and restricts traffic; (8) that eliminating individual profit in the liquor traffic, by replacing the saloon with the Dispensary, decreases consumption of intoxicants to the level of natural desire for drink; and (9) that cheapening the price destroys the incentive to illicit liquor traffic. Furthermore, I have shown, by comparing it with the South Carolina law, that the Hawaiian Dispensary bill is in conformity with these conditions and principles. Therefore, it is now pertinent to estimate the results of its application to local conditions.

So much has been said about the vested rights of the liquor interests that one would suppose the closing of the saloons would shake the financial basis of the country to its very foundation and cause a panic. We have been warned by Mr. Rothwell in the Advertiser of April 1 that the Government will have to pay dearly for destroying the property of the liquor dealers. But before becoming frightened over the matter would it not be best to define what the vested rights of the liquor dealers are?

A saloon starts in business with a set of fine fixtures, a Government license for one year and a stock of liquors more or less expensive. The saloon is, therefore, worth the cost of the fixtures plus the cost of the license plus the cost of the stock of liquors. Can any stretch of the imagination assign any greater value to the saloon than this? The Government, to be sure, has invested the saloon with the right to sell liquor for the space of one year and this right it cannot take away and the Dispensary bill does not destroy it, but provides that all licenses in existence shall be permitted to expire or the manager is empowered to buy it in. Because a saloon business has been in operation, say, for ten years, the license being re-issued year by year, it cannot be claimed that any fictitious value has been vested in the business thereby. If the law had contemplated vesting such value, the license would have been issued for ten years in the beginning.

If a man started a cigar store on a convenient corner, with a lease of the ground for one year, and worked up a good trade and at the expiration of the year the owner wanted his corner, could the cigar man claim vested rights in that favorable location which would compel the owner of the property to continue his lease or pay him a bonus? Certainly not. If the cigar man had no where else to move to, his business would be worth what his fixtures and stock of cigars would sell for. But if the owner of the favorable corner desired to occupy his property before the expiration of the year, he would be compelled to pay the cigar man a bonus for his vested right in the corner for the unexpired term of the lease.

When the Government undertook to limit the number of places where liquor could be sold it declared its right to monopolize and regulate the liquor traffic ostensibly for the public welfare, and it chose to lease this right to individuals, giving them licenses for the term of one year. If at any time the Government chooses to recall this right, for the good of the people and its own profit, the vendor of liquor has no more grounds for complaint than the vendor of cigars for they each took a business chance of making money during the term of the lease. The wholesale liquor dealers, brewers and manufacturers will have no grounds for complaint, for, under the Dispensary system, they will have the same chance of selling to the Government that they now have of selling to saloons. The constitutionality of the law upon all points has been sustained beyond all peradventure, I understand, by nearly a hundred cases in the United States Supreme Court brought in connection with the South Carolina Dispensary law.

It is impossible to obtain exact data upon which to base estimates of financial benefits to be gained by the local application of the Dispensary system, but approximate figures may be used to illustrate the various profits.

The manufacture of distilled liquors is now forbidden, and the brewery is as yet brewing malt liquors; all that can be legally sold is represented by the importation. We can, therefore, safely assume that this will approximately represent the consumption, although it is well known that the illicit manufacture is very large. I have taken the importations for the first five months of 1900 as the basis of the following table:

	Malt Liquors.		—Spirits—		—Wine—		—Saki—	
Imports—	Gals.	Cost.	Gals.	Cost.	Gals.	Cost.	Gals.	Cost.
United States	628,180	\$216,588	36,224	\$58,356	203,306	\$144,648		
Great Britain	12,828	9,480	27,660	37,548	514	532		
Germany	1,374	582	2,555	2,585				
China			21,000	18,900			200,000	140,000
Japan								
Totals	642,382	\$216,550	87,469	\$117,389	203,910	\$145,180	200,000	\$140,000

*Estimated from previous year.

It will be seen that this Territory consumes the enormous amount of 1,134,901 gallons of liquor, that we know of, equal to seven gallons per capita or thirty-five quarts of commerce. Add to this the probable consumption of home-made spirits and beer and it will certainly run considerably over forty quarts per capita. This is the largest pro rata consumption of any country in the world. The cost, laid down, as per invoice, is about \$619,119. Under the Dispensary this will be considerably higher, as a much better quality of spirits will have to be furnished the people. It has generally been supposed that the liquor dealers have furnished their customers a good article; but custom house reports reveal the fact the invoice cost of whiskey, brandy and gin is about \$1.50 a gallon. This seems to be evidence that the vilest kind of liquor is sold. It is probable, then, that the cost of all liquors furnished by the Dispensary will be about \$750,000. Add to this 80 per cent profit (\$600,000), provided for under the bill, and the cost of liquor to the drinking public will be about \$1,350,000 per annum.

Under present conditions, perhaps, two-thirds of the spirits (if not more), or 44,302 gallons, are sold by the glass at 25 cents a drink (twenty-five drinks to the bottle), making a total cost to the drinking public of about \$1,375,000; add 22,156 gallons at \$2 a bottle, makes a total for spirits of \$1,600,520; 403,000 gallons wine, including saki, say, at \$3 retail, \$1,209,000; malt liquors, 643,382 gallons sold partly by the glass and partly by the bottle, at an average of not less than \$1.50 per gallon, \$965,073; samshoo 20,000 gallons, \$100,000; thus making the cost of drinking to the public, under the present private monopoly, \$3,374,573 annually. Deducting cost of all intoxicants, laid down, namely \$619,119, leaves gross profit to liquor dealers, under the high license monopoly, of about \$2,755,454. Under the Dispensary measure the Government cannot charge the drinking public more than \$1,350,000 for the same service now given, thus saving to drinking men and their families \$1,904,454, while the gross profit to the Government would be only about \$600,000, out of which the cost of administration must be paid.

No wonder the liquor dealers are making a desperate fight to save their \$3,000,000 plum that comes out of the pocket of the poor Kanaka and white drunkards, and takes the bread out of the mouths of their wives and children. Heretofore the Government attempted to equalize the enormous profits of the liquor monopoly, by charging a very high rate of duty, which amounted to about the profits of the Dispensary. The Legislature must do something to relieve the situation. It cannot levy an internal revenue tax, and unless the liquor traffic is thrown wide open to general competition, which cannot be tolerated, the liquor trust will be strong enough to hold the retail price of drinks at 25 cents per glass, only paying the Government a pittance for its protection. There is but one safe solution to the problem and that is to pass the Dispensary bill, which gives the Government what it had before and saves the poor people \$3,000,000.

Mr. Rothwell, for the liquor men, quotes an opinion from Justice Brewer concerning the rights of the minority in the prohibition question. Justice Brewer upon this point agrees with Herbert Spencer, who, upon this subject, lays down the principle that "A, the Government, has no right to say that B, the minority, shall not drink if it so desires, even though C, the majority, the master of A, demands it; but if A, has the right to demand that D, the vendor of liquor, shall not incite either A or C to drink." But by what process of reasoning Mr. Rothwell makes Justice Brewer's argument apply to himself, for instance, as an individual interested in the liquor business, I fail to perceive. If the foregoing definition in the earlier clauses of this number, of the individual vested rights of liquor dealers be correct, then the Dispensary bill, by providing protection of these rights, in no way violates the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution. But on the contrary, by affording B, the minority, or drinking man, perfect freedom to obtain liquor, it is not only in conformity with the Fourteenth Amendment of the Constitution, but also with first principles. Under the provisions of the bill, A, the Government, is simply acting upon its right to prevent D, the saloon, from, first, defrauding, and, second, from inciting C, the drinking minority, to imbibe more than his natural desire would lead him to do; and to this end, D, having abused his privileges, A establishes the Dispensary for the convenience and protection of C.

As a whole, the Hawaiian Dispensary bill, if passed, will become one of the most effective and operative laws on the statute books. It is well written and clear in its provisions and does great credit to its author, Senator Nicholas Russell. It is, as I have shown, based upon sound principles, all the way through and in all respects protects individual rights besides being a measure conducive to the public well being. It is absurd to claim that the banishment of the liquor traffic is one of smallest business enterprises in the country. No one would have the temerity to claim that the country was going to the "how-ows" if Ewa plantation were suddenly swept out of existence; yet there would be more than ten times the capital at stake and more than twenty times the people affected by such a calamity than is represented by the entire interests of the Territory. If the law does not pass this Legislature, I shall continue my championship of the bill, nevertheless, and, if I am enabled to do so, shall devote myself to the task of assisting to return a Legislature two years hence pledged to make the bill a law.

FRANKLIN H. AUSTIN.

Ladies, Attention!

SPECIAL SALE OF White Dress Goods.

Great Reduction in Price.

Being Overstocked we Must Sell 2,000 Pieces of fine, new up-to-date White Dress Goods, and would call your attention to the following prices:

**250 Pieces of
Fine Dimity
5 cents a yard**

Former price 10 cents.

**200 Pieces of
Fine Lace Stripes
12 1/2 cents a yard**

Former price 20 cents.

**190 Pieces of
Fine Lace Stripes
10 cents a yard**

Former price 15 cents.

**1,500 Pieces of
White Dress Goods**

Assorted Styles and Patterns, reduced from 20c to 12 1/2 cents,—Must be sold as we are overstocked.

**250 Pieces
Dotted Swiss
10 cents a yard**

Former price 15 cents.

**100 Pieces
Dotted Swiss
12 1/2 cents a yard**

Former price 20 cents.

**150 Pieces
Egyptian Mull
at half price.**

**250 Pieces
India Linen,
reduced Price.**

Our Sheetings Sale will be continued one week longer. Call early and see these Goods. You will find them the best value ever offered in Honolulu.

**L. B. KERR & CO.,
LIMITED.**

Queen St., Honolulu.